



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/512,035	10/20/2004	Gotz-Ekkehard Sapper	PAT-01023	2224

26922 7590 04/11/2008

BASF CORPORATION
Patent Department
1609 BIDDLE AVENUE
MAIN BUILDING
WYANDOTTE, MI 48192

EXAMINER

RONESI, VICKEY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1796

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

04/11/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

LORI.HASS@BASF.COM
MARJORIE.ELLIS@BASF.COM
ANNE.SABOURIN@BASF.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/512,035	Applicant(s) SAPPER ET AL.	
	Examiner VICKY RONESI	Art Unit 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The 103 rejection over Jakubauskas, Sapper, and Bergfried has been withdrawn given that it does not teach or suggest an amount of acrylic dispersant of 0.45-0.75 wt % as required by the instant claims.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.
3. No new grounds of rejection are set forth below. Thus, the following action is properly made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sapper (US 6,284,037) in view of Bergfried (CA 2,154,818).

The rejection is adequately set forth in paragraph 1 of Office action mailed on 10/15/2007 and is incorporated here by reference.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 1/15/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Specifically, applicant argues (A) that Sapper teaches compositions containing a grinding resin which is outside the scope of the instant claims; (B) that Sapper does not teach the use of its composition as a pigment paste which excludes binder; (C) that the examiner has used improper hindsight to arrive at the instant invention; (D) that the amount of mica is not obvious from the teachings of Sapper and Bergfried because the maximum amount of pigment is critical;

Art Unit: 1796

(E) that Sapper exemplifies 17 components and there is too much picking and choosing by the examiner to be combined with Bergfried; and (F) that the conductive pigments taught by Bergfried are not equivalent to the mica taught by Sapper.

With respect to argument (A), Sapper teaches an acrylate polymer which is used to adjust viscosity and stabilize coating formulations (col. 1, lines 53-54). While such polymers may be used as grinding aids as shown by other references as cited by applicant, such is not explicitly taught by Sapper. In fact, Sapper makes no reference to grinding the composition and it has not been shown why one of ordinary skill would want to grind the composition.

With respect to argument (B), the examiner agrees, but this is why the teachings by Bergfried have been relied upon. Bergfried teaches that the nonassociative rheology stabilizer taught by Sapper can be used to prepare pigment pastes. Given that Sapper discloses a composition comprising mica, nonassociative thickener, nonionic surfactant, amine, and water and further given that pigment pastes are known to contain such ingredients before being added to a binder as taught by Bergfried, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the presently claimed pigment paste before adding to a binder to prepare a coating composition. In other words, to mix ingredients in a different order is obvious. Case law holds that the selection of any order of mixing ingredients is *prima facie* obvious. *In re Gibson*, 39 F.2d 975, 5 USPQ 230 (CCPA 1930).

With respect to argument (C), it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's

Art Unit: 1796

disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

With respect to (D), Bergfried discloses a pigment concentrate comprising 40-60 wt % pigment. While this amount is greater than the presently claimed amount of 15-25 wt %, it is the examiner's position that the criticality of the maximum amount is not relevant because the amount of mica rendered *prima facie* obvious is less than the amount taught by Bergfried. No criticality has been disregarded by the examiner.

With respect to argument (E), case law holds that it is perfectly proper for the examiner to look to the whole reference for what it teaches rather than merely rely on preferred embodiments. *In re Courtright* 153 USPQ 735 (CCPA 1967). Specifically, the examiner only relied on the example in Sapper to teach mica as a suitable pigment in the compositions taught by Sapper and to teach the amounts in a final coating composition made from a pigment paste taught by Sapper and Bergfried.

With respect to argument (F), given that the density of a metal oxide pigment is approximately that of mica, it is the examiner's position that a pigment paste composition sufficient to keep dispersed a metal oxide as taught by Bergfried (e.g., tin oxide, about 6 g/cc) would be suitable for mica (about 5 g/cc).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1796

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vickey Ronesi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2701. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/512,035
Art Unit: 1796

Page 6

4/3/2008
Vickey Ronesi

/V. R./
Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/Vasu Jagannathan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796